

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-4, 9-17, and 20-22 will remain pending in this application. Claims 5-8 and 18-19 were previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. For example, the matter added to claims 1, 13, and 22 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0054] and [0058].

Claims 1, 13, and 22 stand objected to because of certain alleged informalities. Claims 1-3, 11-17, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0037228 (“Ito et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,427 (“Faulkner”). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 (“Le”). Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0040401 (“Yasushi et al.”).

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 13, and 22 stand objected to because of certain alleged informalities. In particular, it is alleged that the phrases “persisting both” and “persisting neither” fail to show a distinction between persistence models because they essentially lead to the same result, namely, recording changes in the target datastore whenever the source datastore is updated.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 22 to more clearly differentiate between the persistence properties. In particular, in the persistence property in which both metadata and object data changes of the linked source object are persisted in the target datastore (“persisting both”), claims 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to recite that “changes to metadata of the linked source object are not updated in the target datastore until object data of the linked source object is altered.” By contrast, in the persistence property in which neither metadata nor object data is persisted in the target datastore, “any change made to the linked source object is propagated to the target datastore,” even if the object data of the linked source object has not yet been altered.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the distinction between the “persisting both” and “persisting neither” persistence properties is clear and requests that the objection to claims 1, 13, and 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 11-17, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner. As to claims 1, 13, and 22, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Ito et al. discloses the invention substantially as recited in claim 1, except for the limitation “caching the response in a memory, and registering the response in a registry.” Faulkner is cited as disclosing this limitation at column 23, lines 1-6. In particular, it is asserted that this passage of Faulkner teaches a system for file system performance enhancement in which changes or updates are cached in a least recently used (LRU) cache and are also logged.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to recite the further limitation “specifying at least one restricted object in the source datastore as unlinkable to an object in the target datastore” (in the case of claim 1). This limitation is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0058] (“In some embodiments, dimensions and measure groups can be specified as restricted, meaning these dimensions and measure groups can not be linked to.”). This feature allows the source database to specify certain dimensions as inaccessible, thereby allowing data to be shared or distributed while mitigating some of the problems associated with having multiple copies. See paragraph [0008] of the Specification.

By contrast, it is not seen where either Ito et al. or Faulkner discloses this limitation. Ito et al. appears to disclose a system and method for using metadata that exists independently of schemata of source and destination databases. Ito et al. also discloses at paragraph [0045] that this metadata can be reused when the schemata or other attributes of the source and/or destination databases change by updating the mapping information. However, there does not appear to be any disclosure of a way of expressly preventing linking between dimensions and measure groups between the source and destination databases, as recited in claims 1, 13, and 22.

In view of at least the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, and 22 are patentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner. Claims 2-3 and 11-12 depend from claim 1 and claims 14-17 and 20-21 depend from claim 13; these dependent claims are also patentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner at least by reason of their dependency.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner and further in view of Le. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Even assuming that Le discloses the particular limitations recited in claim 4, it has not been suggested that Le discloses the other limitations of claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. In particular, Le does not appear to disclose at least the limitation “specifying at least one restricted object in the source datastore as unlinkable to an object in the target datastore.” Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner and further in view of Le at least by reason of its dependency from claim 1.

Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner and further in view of Yasushi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Even assuming that Yasushi et al. discloses the particular limitations recited in claims 9-10, it has not been suggested that Yasushi et al. discloses the other limitations of claim 1, from which claims 9-10 depend. In particular, Yasushi et al. does not appear to disclose at least the limitation “specifying at least one restricted object in the source datastore as unlinkable to an object in the target datastore.” Accordingly, claims 9-10 are patentable over Ito et al. in view of Faulkner and further in view of Yasushi et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 1.

Based at least on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and requests reconsideration and removal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

DOCKET NO.: 306352.1 / MSFT-2863
Application No.: 10/750,205
Office Action Dated: December 17, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: March 17, 2009

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439